

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Charles Green, #200072,	)	C/A No. 3:10-3162-JFA-JRM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</b>
vs.	)	
	)	
Richland County Sheriff's Dept.;	)	
Sheriff Leon Lott;	)	
Deputy Sheriff Tom Hodges,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff, Charles Green, proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is an inmate at Turbeville Correctional Institution, a facility of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), and he files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Plaintiff alleges excessive force during an arrest in violation of his constitutional rights, and he seems to request money damages. Defendant Richland County Sheriff's Dept. should be summarily dismissed from this action.

*Pro Se* Review pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA)

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) DSC, the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) (*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983). The Complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted,” “is frivolous or malicious,” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Further, Plaintiff is a prisoner under the definition in 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(c), and “seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Thus, even if Plaintiff had prepaid the full filing fee, this Court is charged with screening Plaintiff’s lawsuit to identify cognizable claims or to dismiss the Complaint if (1) it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, a portion of the Complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the Court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which Plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), or construct Plaintiff’s legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented”

to the Court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

### Discussion

This Complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which "'is not itself a source of substantive rights,' but merely provides 'a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.'" *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n.3 (1979)). A civil action under § 1983 allows "a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief." *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). The named Defendant Richland County Sheriff's Dept. is not a "person" subject to suit in a § 1983 civil rights action. It is well settled that only "persons" may act under color of state law, and, therefore, a defendant in a Section 1983 action must qualify as a "person." The Defendant Richland County Sheriff's Dept. is a department, group of buildings, or a facility. Inanimate objects such as buildings, facilities, and grounds cannot act under color of state law. See *Allison v. California Adult Auth.*, 419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969) (finding that California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *Brooks v. Pembroke City Jail*, 722 F.Supp. 1294, 1301 (E.D.N.C. 1989) ("Claims under § 1983 are

directed at ‘persons’ and the jail is not a person amenable to suit.”). Therefore, Plaintiff failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted as to that Defendant.

Moreover, the Richland County Sheriff’s Dept. has Eleventh Amendment immunity to a suit for money damages. In South Carolina, a sheriff’s department is an agency of the state, not a department under the control of the county. *Gulledge v. Smart*, 691 F.Supp. 947, 954-55 (D.S.C. 1988) (discussing sheriff as agent and alter ego of state and that deputy sheriffs act as the sheriff’s agent), *aff’d*, 878 F.2d 379 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989); *Carroll v. Greenville Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t*, 871 F. Supp. 844, 846 (D.S.C. 1994) (suit against the sheriff’s office is suit against the state). As an agency of the state, the Richland County Sheriff’s Dept. is immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution which divests this Court of jurisdiction to entertain a suit for damages brought against the State of South Carolina or its integral parts. *Stewart v. Beaufort Cnty.*, 481 F.Supp.2d 483, 492 (D.S.C. 2007) (“[A] federal court lacks jurisdiction to hear a cause of action against a South Carolina Sheriff’s Department, as such a suit is barred by state immunity.”) Therefore, in addition to Plaintiff’s failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted, Defendant Richland County Sheriff’s Dept. should also be dismissed because this Court does not have jurisdiction to entertain Plaintiff’s suit against it.

#### Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss Defendant Richland County Sheriff’s Dept. *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal). This action will proceed against

Defendants Sheriff Leon Lott and Deputy Sheriff Tom Hodges.<sup>2</sup> **Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.**



Joseph R. McCrorey  
United States Magistrate Judge

February 24, 2011  
Columbia, South Carolina

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Sheriff Leon Lott and Deputy Sheriff Tom Hodges were personally involved with the excessive force applied against Plaintiff, and, thus, at this point in the proceedings they may be served with legal process. *See Brooks v. Arthur*, 626 F.3d 194, 201, 203 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010) (explaining individual versus official capacities).

### **Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
901 Richland Street  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).